

entire pier. This is an average case. Some of the piers have accommodations for four ships, two on each side. That pier would turn in a profit of \$600 a day. If a pier were rented out on this basis for every day in the year the profit on each would range somewhere between \$60,000. It is regarded as reasonable to suppose that some piers have made profits as high as \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year for their lessees.

Report Filed by Gen. Black.

Gen. Black's report, which was filed with the Federal Shipping Board, states: "The charges per berth for piers before the war were between \$50 and \$100 a day, averaging \$80 and \$90 a day. I am giving here a few examples of the rates now charged." This report was made in June, 1920. Practically the same leases hold to-day. The cases cited are as follows:

"Pier on Manhattan shore, Hudson, 450x80 feet, leased from the city for \$45,000 a year. It has two berths. The cost to the lessee is \$65.67 for each berth per day. The charges made by the lessee for berthing at this pier is \$200 to \$250 a day. This was charged the Shipping Board.

"Pier 651x103 feet, which is leased at \$11,000 a year, or a cost per berth per day of \$152. This is charged for at the rate of \$300.

"Pier 642x102 feet, municipally owned, is leased for \$24,300. The charge per berth per day is \$350. The Shipping Board is charged \$250 per berth per day.

"Pier, covered, 844x80 feet, municipally owned, is rented for \$77,000 a year. This is \$57.47 per berth per day. The charge for berthing is \$250. The average day charge made by the lessee is \$300 a day.

"Another case, the cost to the lessee is \$53.47, and the charge is \$350 to \$500.

"Another case, the berth costs the lessee \$194.75. The charge made by the city is \$200 to \$225, \$250 to \$350, up to \$450 a day.

"There is another pier owned by the city and leased at \$53.47 per berth per day, which has two berths, making the cost \$53.47 per day, and the charges by the lessee are \$300 a day."

Accompanying Gen. Black's report is a detailed chart showing the charges for municipal piers which are leased to shipping companies and individuals and sub-leased. The average rental per berth obtained by the city is about \$53. The average day charge made by the lessee is about \$225.

Showing what happens to shippers, Gen. Black in his report tells of a Shipping Board vessel which entered this harbor for ballast and took on a general cargo. It cost the Government \$25,000 to load that one cargo. Gen. Black states he was informed by a shipper that he had saved \$10,000 on one cargo by sending his ship to Baltimore to load. The report continues:

"The harbor here is congested. During the entire time I was here there were no days passed when there were not two or three of the Shipping Board's vessels lying at anchor in the harbor awaiting a berth. There is no necessity for that. There are berths in New York for the present facilities were taken advantage of."

"Taking the deep sea shipping only, for example, or the piers that are devoted to deep sea shipping, apart from the railroad piers, or the railroad owned piers, there are 477 berths 300 feet long and over, that are used primarily for ocean shipping in this port."

Deep Commerce of New York.

"In 1913 the ocean commerce entering the port of New York consisted of 4,223 vessels; in 1918, 4,242. Therefore we cannot say that the number of ships in ocean commerce has decreased. The number of ships in ocean commerce which use the port for berthing are berths enough to allow each ship to lie at its berth from forty to sixty days."

"Lessees may or may not have ships when they use the piers, and it is optional with them whether or not they lease out space. Few piers have adequate storage facilities, with the result that cargo and the earnings capacity of the piers are improperly used for storage purposes. That is an altogether improper way to use so valuable a thing as pier space in New York city."

"Most of the piers in New York afford space for both the incoming and outgoing cargo, and frequently the incoming cargo must be moved away before the outgoing cargo can be moved, and a greater increased turn around time for the ship."

"It costs at least \$2,000 a day for a ship to lie idle. Then each day that a berth is occupied in that way by an idle ship decreases the earnings capacity of the pier exactly that much. For instance, if a man uses a thousand foot pier for only two ships, the berthing space of those two ships are manifestly wasted, and the pier for berthing three or five ships, which could easily be done."

"There is no system which exists by which freight is transferred by lighter which is unloaded at points which will make the land haul by truck a minimum. No system has existed here for the letting of piers for any particular purpose."

"If a man needs a pier, he gets it where he can get it, and apparently gets it by favor, irrespective of what he is going to do with it; that use he is going to make of it."

Adds to Transportation Costs.

"That means a tremendous increase in the cost of transportation. That situation involves. You take any ship which comes in loaded with freight, 50 per cent. of the cost for Manhattan, she should have a berth in Manhattan because her material can then be handled most economically to its destination by truck. Suppose that ship had to go to South Brooklyn, she is so far away that trucking by horse or by motor becomes extremely expensive, and then all this material has to be brought to Manhattan, and must be handled twice, once into the lighter and out of the lighter to the truck for its final destination."

"If an effort were made to put this harbor into zones to be used in accordance with the cargoes that come in and the destination of the cargoes that come in, the cost of moving goods through this harbor would be enormously decreased. Take the case of a ship coming in with a cargo mainly intended for transportation at once to the interior, surely it is not advantageous to bring her to Manhattan, where everything must be lightered again."

"With the exception of a group of piers beginning about the Fulton Ferry and extending down through the Buttermilk Channel along the Brooklyn shore and down to the army piers, there are no piers anywhere in direct connection with the piers here in the city, and yet a very large part of the material that comes in comes in un-aided and has to be stored until sold. The piers are simply cluttered up, and if a pier is used with incoming cargo it cannot be used, the berths cannot be used and congestion is caused."

Shows City's Shortightedness.

"Piers of the port of New York are really more essential to the prosperity of the city than are its streets, because the pier is the first thing for which New York was created, and the streets were for the service of the piers, and yet they are not looked upon the same. Nobody dreams of giving special privileges for the streets; nobody dreams of having them supported other than by general taxation; nobody dreams of making revenue out of the streets, and yet here in your port even the city itself is making revenue out of its piers; it allows a large part of this essential public utility to be privately owned, and

if privately owned naturally revenue must come from it. "All of this congestion, it is impossible to get berths always even at the rates charged. An operator who has a valuable cargo of sugar and coffee. The least he could get a berth for in this port was \$375 a day. Add to that the trouble with the excessive lighterage charges, add to that the difficulties about the unloading of trucks, the excessive trucking charges and all the other charges and you will see what is the matter with New York."

Further documentary evidence in the hands of the Meyer committee dealing with pier leases includes correspondence between the International Maritime Corporation, the United States Shipping Board and the Tropical Steamship Corporation. This deals with Pier 2 and Pier 31, North River.

\$300 a Day to Shipping Board.

Steamships belonging to the Shipping Board occupied the berths on the north side of Pier 31 for 130 days and both sides of Pier 2 for 101 days. Pier 2 was leased from Carroll, Hagan & Carroll on a monthly basis from April 19 to June 13, 1920, at \$200 a day. Pier 31 was rented for \$400 a day. The Tropical company went into the hands of a receiver and the Shipping Board made inquiry regarding its operating costs.

Statements in these letters show that the Tropical company paid \$3,900 to Carroll, Hagan & Carroll for Pier 2 and \$4,440 to the United States Transport Company for Pier 31. Charges made against vessels obtaining berths at these piers amounted to \$198,658. The amount paid by the Shipping Board was \$101,456.

Small revenue is derived by New York from its \$200,000,000 pier system, the biggest and most important to commerce in this country, because the municipal plan of operating the piers is "inadequate, unfair and unprofitable." Admission of this fact was made by Murray Hulbert, Dock Commissioner and Tammany nominee for President of the Board of Aldermen, testifying yesterday in City Hall before the Meyer investigating committee.

Before Suspending Its Inquiry Into the Department of Education and Taking up docks the committee brought out the fact C. B. J. Snyder, superintendent of school buildings, warned officials of the menace of fire dangers in the public schools because of wholesale violations of fire prevention rules, and urged that the buildings be made safe to prevent a great disaster.

In spite of that warning and repeated demands for funds to do the work the Board of Estimate and the Board of Education remained indifferent to the peril through the first three years of the Hylan administration, and did not even try to lessen the danger. The administration had no policy for dealing with it.

After giving his testimony before the Meyer committee Mr. Snyder went before the Board of Education and reversed himself completely. Reporting to the board, which is his employer, Mr. Snyder contradicted his earlier testimony by declaring none of the school buildings is unsafe; that the officials have done all necessary to guard against fire peril, and that instead of more than 7,000 violations of fire rules there are fewer than 400. It was explained Mr. Snyder's second statement was given to allay the fears of parents.

Ettinger Contradicts Hylan.

William L. Ettinger, Superintendent of Schools, refuted the old charge, made over and over again by Mayor Hylan, that the money spent in experimenting with the Gary system in the schools was wasted. It was well spent, he said. The Ettinger system now in the schools is a modification of the Gary system, for which it was substituted.

Commissioner Hulbert was the most willing witness yet heard by the committee. He was voluble. In answer to almost every question asked by Elton R. Brown, counsel, the witness broke into a long explanation and argument which resembled closely a stump speech. He recited his achievements in Congress and as Commissioner. Once he ended a speech by asking a question, and Mr. Brown broke in with a quick answer, saying:

"At last I have a chance to get in one word—I answer 'No.'"

"There is a lot more I can tell you," the witness said a moment later, at the end of another speech, but Mr. Brown threw up his hands and said: "No, don't; I don't dare to start you again." Through the course of these addresses for two hours the committee obtained little information regarding piers. Finally, Mr. Brown said:

"You think that the present system of leasing piers is inequitable, unfair and unprofitable, don't you?"

"I think it works out that way," the witness said.

"Then it is, isn't it?"

"You are trying to get me to discuss the system as a system and I am trying to keep before your mind—"

New Competitor Handicapped.

"I am not trying to get you to discuss anything. I am trying to get you to tell me."

"What I criticize about the present system is that a man who may be going into the shipping business to-day to compete with a man who has been in the business and who has had a lease of a city dock for thirty years must pay a rental of from three to four times greater than his competitor to begin with."

"In other words, the return to the city is unequal on the different pier properties under the present system?"

"Yes."

"Inequitable in its charge to the man that leases it?"

"Yes."

"He either pays too much or pays too little—is that right?"

"That is right."

"And if put on an equitable basis would be more beneficial to the city, to the lessee and to the public?"

"Yes, it would be more beneficial to the lessee who has a lease since 1889, under which he is paying one-third of the present value."

"Would it be to your advantage if you have made any estimate of the amount that the city could reasonably hope to receive, consistent with the carrying out of its purpose of stimulating commerce, by way of income from its dock properties?"

"The only estimate I have made in what revenue the city will receive when the dock improvements under way are completed, plus the receipts which they are receiving under improvements that are already completed."

"What result did you get at?"

"I estimated that by the end of 1922 the city would be receiving something over \$10,000,000 a year in dock rentals,

CITY LOSES HEAVILY IN PIER LEASE PLAN

Hulbert Calls Method of Operating Inadequate, Unfair and Unprofitable.

NEW LESSEES SUFFER

Must Pay Rentals Three or Four Times Larger Than Old Leaseholders.

FIRE PERIL DISREGARDED

Superintendent Snyder Testifies to His Repeated Warnings of School Disaster.

Would Have No Lessees.

"If I had my way the city would acquire the whole waterfront property and there would be no lessees," the witness said.

"What have you done to change the policy you disapproved since you have been in office?"

"Discussed it with members of the Sinking Fund Commission, who are my superiors. None of them accepted my point of view."

"Has it ever occurred to you that when you found unanimous opposition you had better revise your opinion?"

"I have had that question asked me. 'And the matter of making leases has continued as before?'"

"The commissioner said he had renewed leases which he thought were detrimental to the port because there was nothing else to do. He disapproved of the system of renewals after twenty years with 10 per cent. increases, but had made such leases. After long sparring it was brought out that the return on some of the piers was 5 per cent. and 2 1/2 per cent. on others."

"We would not take a pier at Forty-sixth street which the Mitchell administration built at a cost of \$4,000,000 and allow you to tie up river boats with menhaden and come down from Cohoes and Hudson and pay the rates of wharfage we are limited to charge," the witness said.

"I am not examining you as President of the Board of Aldermen," Mr. Brown said. Examination of the commissioner will continue this forenoon.

Violation of Fire Rules.

Testifying regarding violations of the city's fire prevention rules, Mr. Snyder said, answering queries:

"We have not prepared any schedule which would be at all accurate as we were not able to have the violations removed. I do not think any statement has been prepared regarding the violations since 1915. We have not made up any list of what you regard as serious violations."

"This question of doing away with violations of the fire prevention rules has been a matter of a good deal of concern to you for several years, hasn't it?"

"Yes, sir."

"And you have made efforts to secure money for the purpose of correcting the conditions?"

"Yes, sir."

"You have reported it frequently to the Board of Education?"

"I see in your letter of March 18, 1921, that you say: 'The condition in relation to fire prevention with the continued growth of schools and consequent overcrowding and congestion, causes me great uneasiness and distress of mind. Is that true?'"

"It was."

"If the fire prevention work was and is required for schools under normal conditions, how much more important must it be when buildings contain quite one-half or more in excess of the normal?"

"Yes, sir."

"You stated in your letter, 'I sincerely hope that a resumption of the carrying out of this most important work may be brought about without the stimulus represented perhaps by some awful accident, either here or elsewhere.' You said that, didn't you?"

"That is in the letter, yes."

Adheres to His Warning.

"You adhere to it?"

"I do."

"I notice you say, 'Why paint and renovate the interior of a building when there are essential items of fire prevention work to be performed, which would naturally operate to safeguard life and lessen fire risk?'"

"You state further, 'I would earnestly recommend that the Board of Education adopt resolutions for transmission to the Board of Estimate and Appropriation, stating the stern necessity of prompt action upon the board's request for funds to enable the department to undertake immediately fire prevention work that is absolutely necessary if we are to safeguard properly the lives of the children entrusted to our care.' That is your letter?"

How Hines Hit Murphy

THE following table shows what a dent was made by the "straight Murphy" vote by James J. Hines, running for the Democratic nomination for President of the Borough of Manhattan against Julius Miller, the "phone booth" selection of Charles Francis Murphy:

	Murphy.	Hines.
1.	2,310	373
2.	1,200	140
3.	1,705	1,640
4.	1,321	117
5.	1,258	1,591
6.	1,017	32
7.	775	553
8.	804	285
9.	642	967
10.	586	3,089
11.	700	3,003
12.	2,883	692
13.	586	1,996
14.	1,111	1,410
15.	1,007	1,258
16.	1,538	254
17.	1,209	592
18.	975	645
19.	544	508
20.	1,010	1,615
Totals	26,713	20,167
Miller's majority	8,544	

HINES TO APPEAL FOR VOTE RECOUNT

Continued from First Page.

ured by Tammany workers that they would line up behind Hines and give him the district, and for that reason few Hines workers were assigned. The defeat came only by a double cross, the Hines workers claimed.

Hines carried the Ninth Assembly District, which lies between Eighty-third and 101st streets and extends irregularly from the Hudson River to Central Park West. Thomas Williams has been the leader of that district for three years, since he beat Ross Williams for the place while Ross Williams was overseas with the Knights of Columbus. Thus, Murphy ended a leadership which had not been at all times as faithful as he desired.

Hines, of course, carried his own district, the Eleventh, which lies generally between the Hudson and St. Nicholas avenue and 101st and 119th streets, although, he said, "they had their best safe cracking cops on the job at every voting place."

August Wise Bowled Over.

In the Thirteenth district—Hudson River, 116th, Manhattan avenue, 136th street—August M. Wise had his first taste of battle since he was designated leader several months ago by Murphy to succeed the late John H. O'Connell. Hines put him under the table.

The Fourteenth district runs generally from the East River to Lexington avenue, between Fifty-fourth and Eighty-fourth streets, and is ruled over by Thomas M. Farley for Tammany—or, not infrequently, against Tammany. Farley beat John V. Cogger, Murphy's ally, there in April of last year, and political observers took Hines's victory over Farley with something of a wink.

In the Twentieth district—East River, 11th street, Fifth avenue, 14th street—Hines outgeneraled Percy Nagle, of whom Murphy thought enough in his telephone booth conversation to put on the Tammany ticket for Sheriff. Hines carried the district by 2 to 1, and the victory came just at a time when Nagle had been back in the good graces of Murphy only a year or so, having been given the gate as district leader by the boss half a dozen years ago. It is understood he won the district back and his place on the ballot largely by his record overseas, having gone in the service as a private and came out a major. There was much speculation yesterday as to whether Nagle would be able to hold his own against Hines.

Edward Holahan, Deputy Register of New York County, the leader who couldn't deliver in the Twenty-first district, lying generally between the Hudson and Harlem rivers from 156th to 165th street, Holahan became leader when the district obtained new boundaries from redistricting.

Joseph McCormick, leader of the Twenty-second, bounded roughly by 14th street, the Hudson, St. Nicholas avenue and 165th street, lost his district, as did also John Mara, for two years leader of the Twenty-third district, lying between the Hudson and the Harlem above 165th street.

The contest was very close in the

How Hines Hit Murphy

THE following table shows what a dent was made by the "straight Murphy" vote by James J. Hines, running for the Democratic nomination for President of the Borough of Manhattan against Julius Miller, the "phone booth" selection of Charles Francis Murphy:

	Murphy.	Hines.
1.	2,310	373
2.	1,200	140
3.	1,705	1,640
4.	1,321	117
5.	1,258	1,591
6.	1,017	32
7.	775	553
8.	804	285
9.	642	967
10.	586	3,089
11.	700	3,003
12.	2,883	692
13.	586	1,996
14.	1,111	1,410
15.	1,007	1,258
16.	1,538	254
17.	1,209	592
18.	975	645
19.	544	508
20.	1,010	1,615
Totals	26,713	20,167
Miller's majority	8,544	

HINES TO APPEAL FOR VOTE RECOUNT

Continued from First Page.

ured by Tammany workers that they would line up behind Hines and give him the district, and for that reason few Hines workers were assigned. The defeat came only by a double cross, the Hines workers claimed.

Hines carried the Ninth Assembly District, which lies between Eighty-third and 101st streets and extends irregularly from the Hudson River to Central Park West. Thomas Williams has been the leader of that district for three years, since he beat Ross Williams for the place while Ross Williams was overseas with the Knights of Columbus. Thus, Murphy ended a leadership which had not been at all times as faithful as he desired.

Hines, of course, carried his own district, the Eleventh, which lies generally between the Hudson and St. Nicholas avenue and 101st and 119th streets, although, he said, "they had their best safe cracking cops on the job at every voting place."

August Wise Bowled Over.

In the Thirteenth district—Hudson River, 116th, Manhattan avenue, 136th street—August M. Wise had his first taste of battle since he was designated leader several months ago by Murphy to succeed the late John H. O'Connell. Hines put him under the table.

The Fourteenth district runs generally from the East River to Lexington avenue, between Fifty-fourth and Eighty-fourth streets, and is ruled over by Thomas M. Farley for Tammany—or, not infrequently, against Tammany. Farley beat John V. Cogger, Murphy's ally, there in April of last year, and political observers took Hines's victory over Farley with something of a wink.

In the Twentieth district—East River, 11th street, Fifth avenue, 14th street—Hines outgeneraled Percy Nagle, of whom Murphy thought enough in his telephone booth conversation to put on the Tammany ticket for Sheriff. Hines carried the district by 2 to 1, and the victory came just at a time when Nagle had been back in the good graces of Murphy only a year or so, having been given the gate as district leader by the boss half a dozen years ago. It is understood he won the district back and his place on the ballot largely by his record overseas, having gone in the service as a private and came out a major. There was much speculation yesterday as to whether Nagle would be able to hold his own against Hines.

Edward Holahan, Deputy Register of New York County, the leader who couldn't deliver in the Twenty-first district, lying generally between the Hudson and Harlem rivers from 156th to 165th street, Holahan became leader when the district obtained new boundaries from redistricting.

Joseph McCormick, leader of the Twenty-second, bounded roughly by 14th street, the Hudson, St. Nicholas avenue and 165th street, lost his district, as did also John Mara, for two years leader of the Twenty-third district, lying between the Hudson and the Harlem above 165th street.

The contest was very close in the

How Hines Hit Murphy

THE following table shows what a dent was made by the "straight Murphy" vote by James J. Hines, running for the Democratic nomination for President of the Borough of Manhattan against Julius Miller, the "phone booth" selection of Charles Francis Murphy:

	Murphy.	Hines.
1.	2,310	373
2.	1,200	140
3.	1,705	1,640
4.	1,321	117
5.	1,258	1,591
6.	1,017	32
7.	775	553
8.	804	285
9.	642	967
10.	586	3,089
11.	700	3,003
12.	2,883	692
13.	586	1,996
14.	1,111	1,410
15.	1,007	1,258
16.	1,538	254
17.	1,209	592
18.	975	645
19.	544	508
20.	1,010	1,615
Totals	26,713	20,167
Miller's majority	8,544	

HINES TO APPEAL FOR VOTE RECOUNT

Continued from First Page.

ured by Tammany workers that they would line up behind Hines and give him the district, and for that reason few Hines workers were assigned. The defeat came only by a double cross, the Hines workers claimed.

Hines carried the Ninth Assembly District, which lies between Eighty-third and 101st streets and extends irregularly from the Hudson River to Central Park West. Thomas Williams has been the leader of that district for three years, since he beat Ross Williams for the place while Ross Williams was overseas with the Knights of Columbus. Thus, Murphy ended a leadership which had not been at all times as faithful as he desired.

Hines, of course, carried his own district, the Eleventh, which lies generally between the Hudson and St. Nicholas avenue and 101st and 119th streets, although, he said, "they had their best safe cracking cops on the job at every voting place."

August Wise Bowled Over.

In the Thirteenth district—Hudson River, 116th, Manhattan avenue, 136th street—August M. Wise had his first taste of battle since he was designated leader several months ago by Murphy to succeed the late John H. O'Connell. Hines put him under the table.

The Fourteenth district runs generally from the East River to Lexington avenue, between Fifty-fourth and Eighty-fourth streets, and is ruled over by Thomas M. Farley for Tammany—or, not infrequently, against Tammany. Farley beat John V. Cogger, Murphy's ally, there in April of last year, and political observers took Hines's victory over Farley with something of a wink.

In the Twentieth district—East River, 11th street, Fifth avenue, 14th street—Hines outgeneraled Percy Nagle, of whom Murphy thought enough in his telephone booth conversation to put on the Tammany ticket for Sheriff. Hines carried the district by 2 to 1, and the victory came just at a time when Nagle had been back in the good graces of Murphy only a year or so, having been given the gate as district leader by the boss half a dozen years ago. It is understood he won the district back and his place on the ballot largely by his record overseas, having gone in the service as a private and came out a major. There was much speculation yesterday as to whether Nagle would be able to hold his own against Hines.

Edward Holahan, Deputy Register of New York County, the leader who couldn't deliver in the Twenty-first district, lying generally between the Hudson and Harlem